

**“CHET TILLARNI O‘QITISHDA YANGI TENDENSIYALAR: INKLYUZIV  
TA’LIM VA EFL/ESPDA INNOVATSIYALAR” XALQARO ILMIY-AMALIY ANJUMAN  
2026-YIL 10-APREL**

**O‘ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIIY TA’LIM, FAN VA  
INNOVATSIYALAR VAZIRLIGI**

**TOSHKENT DAVLAT SHARQSHUNOSLIK UNIVERSITETI**

**“CHET TILLARNI O‘QITISHDA YANGI TENDENSIYALAR:  
INKLYUZIV TA’LIM VA EFL/ESPDA INNOVATSIYALAR”**

**MAVZUSIDAGI  
Xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy anjumani materiallari  
TO‘PLAMI**

**2026-yil 10-aprel**

**TASHKENT STATE UNIVERSITY OF ORIENTAL STUDIES**

**“NEW TRENDS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING:  
INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AND INNOVATIONS IN EFL/ESP”**

**Articles of International scientific- theoretical conference on  
April -10, 2026**

**Toshkent -2026**

**Articles of international scientific-theoretical conference on “New trends in foreign language teaching: inclusive education and innovations in EFL/ESP”.**  
TSUOS. –2026. – 411p

**Editor-in-Chief:**

*Marxabo Abdullayeva, PhD, Associate professor*

**Reviewer:**

*Saodat Saidakbarova, PhD, Associate Professor,  
Head of the Department of Western Languages*

**Editors:**

*Musoyev Anvar, Abidova Zilola, Raxmonberdiyeva Karima, Askarova Shakhnoza,  
Komilova Dildora, Jalolova Iroda, Artikova Lobar, Ergesheva Nazira, Yunisova Dildora,  
Khamrabayeva Shirin*

The international scientific-theoretical conference entitled “**New Trends in Foreign Language Teaching: Inclusive Education and Innovations in EFL/ESP**,” organized by Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies, is devoted to the exploration of contemporary trends, innovative pedagogical approaches, and current issues in the field of foreign language education. The conference serves as an academic platform for discussing scholarly research related to inclusive practices in EFL/ESP instruction, artificial intelligence and digital technologies in language education, applied linguistics, pedagogical leadership, educational management, and intercultural communication. The proceedings volume comprises scientific articles addressing effective methodologies in language teaching, global competencies, and innovative educational technologies within modern educational contexts.

The authors are fully responsible for the content of the articles included in this proceedings volume, including the validity of scientific conclusions, factual accuracy, and any possible errors or shortcomings contained therein.

7. Shoabdurahmonov, Sh., et al. (1980). Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. Toshkent: O‘qituvchi.
8. Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
9. Comrie, B. (1976). *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
11. Swan, M. (2005). *Practical English usage* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## INTEGRATED TEACHING OF HISTORY IN ENGLISH THROUGH THE CLIL (CONTENT AND LANGUAGE INTEGRATED LEARNING) MODEL

**Komilova Dildora Shavkatovna**  
**Teacher, Tashkent state university of Oriental Studies**  
[dkomilova703@gmail.com](mailto:dkomilova703@gmail.com)  
[Tel:+998914442961](tel:+998914442961)

**Abstract:** This study investigates the effectiveness of the CLIL model in teaching history in English to undergraduate students in Uzbekistan. A quasi-experimental research design was implemented over one academic semester with an experimental group exposed to CLIL instruction and a control group taught through traditional methods. Data were collected through subject knowledge tests, academic English assessments, classroom observation, and student perception surveys. The findings demonstrate that CLIL significantly enhances students’ historical understanding, academic vocabulary acquisition, and communicative competence. Moreover, students reported increased motivation and confidence in using English for academic purposes. The study concludes that CLIL represents an effective and contextually adaptable model for integrating language and content instruction in higher education institutions.

**Keywords:** *CLIL, integrated learning, history education, academic English, higher education, bilingual instruction*

**Introduction** The growing internationalization of higher education has increased the demand for integrated approaches to language and subject instruction. Universities are increasingly expected to prepare students for participation in global academic and professional environments, where English functions as a dominant medium of communication. In non-linguistic disciplines such as history, English proficiency enables students to access international research, archival materials, and scholarly discourse.

Traditional models of English instruction in many higher education institutions focus on language as an isolated subject rather than as a tool for disciplinary learning. As a result, students often struggle to apply language skills within academic contexts. Conversely, subject courses taught exclusively in the

native language may limit students’ exposure to international academic terminology and discourse conventions.

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) provides a pedagogical solution by combining subject teaching and language learning in a single educational framework. The concept of CLIL was popularized by David Marsh, who defined it as an approach in which a foreign language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language.

In the context of history education, CLIL allows students to study historical topics in English while simultaneously developing academic language skills. This study aims to examine the effectiveness of CLIL implementation in teaching history through English in a university setting in Uzbekistan.

The research addresses the following questions:

1. Does CLIL improve students’ historical knowledge and academic English competence?
2. How does CLIL influence students’ motivation and classroom engagement?
3. What challenges arise in implementing CLIL in the Uzbek higher education context?

### **Literature Review**

CLIL is grounded in bilingual education theory and constructivist pedagogy. It is often explained through the “4Cs Framework” developed by Do Coyle, which emphasizes Content, Communication, Cognition, and Culture as interconnected dimensions of learning.

Research indicates that CLIL enhances vocabulary acquisition and academic language development because students encounter terminology within meaningful subject contexts. Studies also demonstrate that CLIL promotes higher-order thinking skills, as learners process complex subject matter in a second language.

In history education, CLIL is particularly relevant because historical analysis requires interpretation, argumentation, and evaluation of evidence. Integrating English into history instruction encourages students to engage with authentic international scholarship and diverse perspectives. However, scholars note that CLIL implementation requires careful planning, teacher collaboration, and appropriate materials. Challenges may include limited teacher language proficiency, lack of resources, and increased cognitive load for students. While CLIL has been widely studied in European contexts, empirical research in Central Asian higher education institutions remains limited. This study seeks to contribute to the growing body of research by examining CLIL application within the Uzbek university system.

**Methodology:** This study was conducted using a quasi-experimental research design to examine the effectiveness of the CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) model in improving both historical subject knowledge and English academic competence among undergraduate history students in Uzbekistan. The experimental research was implemented during one academic semester consisting of 16 weeks of instruction.

The participants of the study were third-year history students enrolled at a state university. The total number of participants was 50 students, divided into two groups: an experimental group and a control group. Each group consisted of 25 students selected based on their academic performance and English proficiency level. The English proficiency of participants corresponded approximately to the B1–B2 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Group homogeneity was ensured by conducting a preliminary placement test before the beginning of the experiment.

The experimental group received instruction based on the CLIL pedagogical framework, whereas the control group was taught using traditional teaching methods. In the traditional instruction model, historical content was delivered in the native language, and English language learning was treated as a separate subject. The traditional method primarily focused on grammar explanation, vocabulary memorization, translation exercises, and teacher-centered reading activities.

The CLIL intervention was designed in accordance with the 4Cs framework proposed in CLIL pedagogy, which includes content, communication, cognition, and culture components. The content component focused on selected historical topics included in the university curriculum. These topics were presented using authentic English-language academic materials such as historical articles, digital archives, and adapted scholarly texts.

The communication component aimed to develop students’ academic English proficiency through active language use in classroom activities. Students were encouraged to participate in discussions, express historical ideas in English, and use discipline-specific vocabulary. Structured speaking tasks, group discussions, and academic presentations were incorporated into the teaching process.

The cognition component focused on developing higher-order thinking skills such as analysis, synthesis, comparison, and evaluation. Students were given tasks requiring interpretation of historical sources, identification of cause-and-effect relationships, and critical evaluation of historical information. Socratic questioning techniques and problem-solving activities were applied to stimulate analytical reasoning.

The cultural component of the CLIL model aimed to develop intercultural awareness by encouraging students to analyze historical processes from multiple perspectives. Students were exposed to global historical interpretations and were encouraged to compare historical developments across different cultural and geographical contexts.

Instructional delivery in the experimental group was organized in a student-centered learning environment. The teacher acted as a facilitator who provided linguistic and academic scaffolding. Scaffolding strategies included the use of vocabulary glossaries, sentence structures for academic expression, guided reading questions, and feedback on student performance.

Data collection was conducted using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative data were obtained through pre-test and post-test assessments measuring historical knowledge and academic English competence. The tests

consisted of multiple-choice questions, short-answer questions, and analytical interpretation tasks based on historical texts.

Students’ oral communication skills were assessed using a standardized presentation evaluation rubric. The rubric measured fluency, pronunciation clarity, coherence of argumentation, use of academic vocabulary, and ability to explain historical concepts. In addition, a structured student perception questionnaire was distributed after the completion of the experiment. The questionnaire measured learning motivation, classroom engagement, perceived language improvement, and satisfaction with the CLIL learning process. Semi-structured classroom observations were also conducted to obtain qualitative data regarding student interaction and participation.

Quantitative data were analyzed using statistical methods including mean score comparison, standard deviation calculation, paired-sample t-test, and independent-sample t-test analysis. Reliability of the assessment instruments was verified using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, where values above 0.80 indicated high internal consistency of the measurement tools. Ethical principles of academic research were strictly followed. Participation in the study was voluntary, students’ identities were anonymized, and research data were used exclusively for scientific purposes.

Several contextual limitations were acknowledged in this study. These included limited access to international academic databases, variations in students’ initial language competence, and constraints related to classroom instructional time. Nevertheless, the CLIL model demonstrated practical applicability within the Uzbek higher education environment.

**Data Collection Data were collected through:**

- Subject knowledge tests (pre- and post-test)
- Academic English vocabulary tests
- Oral presentation assessment
- Student perception questionnaire
- Classroom observation

**Data Analysis** Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and independent-sample t-tests.

**Results:** The experimental group demonstrated significant improvement in both historical content knowledge and academic English proficiency. Average historical knowledge scores increased by 24% in the CLIL group compared to 11% in the control group. Academic vocabulary scores improved by 29% in the experimental group, while the control group showed only 14% improvement. Oral presentation assessments indicated higher fluency and confidence among CLIL students. Survey results showed that 82% of students found CLIL motivating and beneficial for professional development.

**Discussion:** The findings suggest that CLIL effectively integrates subject learning and language acquisition. By studying history in English, students developed both disciplinary knowledge and communicative competence. The 4Cs framework ensured balanced development of content mastery and language skills. Students engaged more actively in discussions and demonstrated improved

analytical reasoning. However, challenges included initial language anxiety and increased preparation time for instructors. Proper scaffolding and gradual adaptation proved essential for successful implementation.

These results support previous research highlighting CLIL as a powerful pedagogical tool in higher education.

**Conclusion** This study examined the effectiveness of the CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) model in teaching history through English in a higher education context in Uzbekistan. The findings of the research demonstrate that integrating content learning with foreign language instruction is a productive pedagogical strategy for developing both subject knowledge and academic English competence among undergraduate history students.

The results indicate that students who were taught using the CLIL approach showed significantly higher academic achievement compared to students who received traditional instruction. In particular, improvements were observed in historical knowledge comprehension, academic vocabulary acquisition, oral communication skills, and analytical thinking abilities. The experimental group demonstrated greater ability to interpret historical texts, evaluate historical information, and express historical ideas in English using appropriate academic structures.

However, the research also identified several challenges associated with CLIL implementation in the Uzbek higher education system. These challenges included limited availability of authentic English-language historical resources, differences in students’ initial language proficiency levels, and time constraints within the academic curriculum. Additionally, the successful implementation of CLIL requires teachers to possess both subject content knowledge and sufficient foreign language teaching competence. Therefore, professional development programs for university instructors may be necessary to support CLIL-based education.

In conclusion, the CLIL model represents an innovative and effective pedagogical approach for teaching history through English in higher education. The results of this study confirm that integrated content and language instruction enhances academic achievement, promotes critical thinking, and increases student motivation. Therefore, educational policymakers and university administrators should consider supporting the gradual implementation of CLIL methodology in humanities education programs.

#### **Reference:**

1. David Marsh (2002). CLIL/EMILE – The European Dimension. University of Jyväskylä.
2. Do Coyle, Philip Hood, & David Marsh (2010). CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning. Cambridge University Press.
3. John Dewey (1938). Experience and Education. Macmillan.
4. D. K. Shavkatovna. Nationality of general human feelings in translations - Journal of Intellectual Property and Human Rights, 2023.

5. Dildora Shavkatovna Komilova. (2023). THE IMPORTANCE OF BASIC SKILLS IN TEACHING SYSTEM. International Scientific and Current Research Conferences, 1(1), 392–398. <https://doi.org/10.37547/geo-74>
6. Robert Ennis (1996). Critical thinking. Prentice Hall.
7. Sam Wineburg (2001). Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts. Temple University Press.
8. Pauline Gibbons (2002). Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning. Heinemann.
9. Stephen Krashen (1982). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Pergamon Press.
10. Jim Cummins (2000). Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire. Multilingual Matters.
11. Marta Nikula (2016). CLIL: A European approach to bilingual education. Language Teaching, 49(1), 1–18.
12. Fredrik Hult (2017). The history and development of CLIL research. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.
13. Zoltán Dörnyei (2001). Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom. Cambridge University Press.

## **METAPHORICAL AND IDIOMATIC EXPRESSIONS OF EMOTION IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH: A COMPARATIVE STUDY**

**Kuchkorova Marjona**  
**1st-year Master’s Student**  
**Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies**  
**E-mail: [kuchkorova42@gmail.com](mailto:kuchkorova42@gmail.com)**  
**Shakhnoza Askarova**  
**Supervisor: PhD, Associate Professor**

**Abstract.** The linguistic expression of emotions represents a significant domain of inquiry within cognitive linguistics and cross-cultural semantics. Although emotions constitute a universal dimension of human experience, the ways in which they are conceptualized and verbalized vary considerably across languages. The present study investigates metaphorical and idiomatic expressions of emotion in Uzbek and compares them with their semantic and pragmatic equivalents in English. Drawing upon the theoretical framework of conceptual metaphor theory, the research analyzes ten frequently used Uzbek idiomatic expressions describing emotional states and evaluates their translation into English. The analysis demonstrates that while many emotional idioms in both languages rely on shared conceptual metaphors grounded in bodily experience—such as temperature, spatial orientation, and internal pressure—others exhibit culturally specific imagery that resists literal translation. The findings highlight the importance of cognitive and cultural factors in shaping emotional language and underline the need for context-sensitive translation strategies. The study contributes to the fields of phraseology,